paradox; but I am willing to admit a contradiction
in the Eternal which I am not compelled to think
out, rather than a contradiction here of my primary
conceptions which I am compelled to think out
logically and to practical ends. I am on this
supposition able either to take the world as-
practically real and think and act in it or to reject
it as an unreality and cease to think and act; I am
not compelled to reconcile contradictions, not called
on to be conscious of and conscious in something-
beyond myself and world and yet deal from that
basis, as God does, with a world of contradictions.
The attempt to be as God while I am still an
individual or to be three things at a time seems
to me to involve a logical confusion and a practical
impossibility." Such might well be the attitude of
the normal reason, and it is clear, lucid, positive in
its distinctions; it involves no extraordinary
gymnastics of the reason trying to exceed itself and
losing itself in shadows and half-lights or any kind
of mysticism, or at least there is only one original
and comparatively simple mysticism free from all
other difficult complexities. Therefore it is the-
reasoning which is the most satisfactory to the

simply rational mind. Yet is there here a triple
error, the error of making an unbridgeable gulf
between the Absolute and the relative, the error of
making too simple and rigid and extending too far
the law of contradictions and the error of conceiving
in terms of Time the genesis of things which have
their origin and first habitat in the Eternal.